

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/507,542	02/18/2000	Joseph K. Davidson	P950	8012	
75	590 05/24/2004		EXAM	INER	
Daniel L Dawes			GARCIA OTERO, EDUARDO		
Myers Dawes & Andras LLP 5252 Kenilworth Drive		PAPER NUMBER			
3 2 3 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ach, CA 92649		2123	2123	
			DATE MAILED: 05/24/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A II - C No	Applicant(s)					
	Application No.	DAVIDSON ET AL.					
Advisory Action	09/507,542						
	Examiner Edwards Carolo Otoro	Art Unit 2123					
	Eduardo Garcia-Otero						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe			,,,				
THE REPLY FILED 4/26/04 FAILS TO PLACE THIS API Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	old abandonment of this application application at the properties application	h places the application	11 11 1				
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from:	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the main three	g date of the liftal rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. Se R 1.136(a) and the approprount of the fee. The approproriginally set in the final Off	ee MPEP riate extension riate extension fice action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simp	lifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: See attachment.							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been cons 	idered but does NOT p	place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12,16-19, and 21–28</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
10.⊠ Other: <u>See attachment.</u>							

Regarding 09/507,542

Applicant's Reply was received 4/26/04.

Applicant's Remarks page 17 state "Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for pointing out patentable material lin Claims 2-12, 16, 21-23, 25-28 which will be considered if rewritten in definite form".

Claims 2-12, 16, 21-23, 25-28 were not indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Please note that the Final Action merely stated "the Examiner believes that this application contains substantial potentially allowable material. Specifically, the specification discusses certain complex interactions between tolerances which are not disclosed in the prior art of record" at paragraph 68 of the Final Action.

Said complex interactions refers to some of the complex interactions in the specification, for example see specification FIG 12a. Note that there is substantial prior art on propogation of simple tolerances on simple figures, for example the tolerance of a set of line segments being placed in series would have a maximum tolerance equal to the sum of the maximum tolerance of each line segment. Note the commercial tolerance analysis packages Mech. Advantage, and VSA-3D mentioned in Final Action paragraph 57 and 58.

Applicant's potential allowable subject matter resides in the complex interactions between different types of tolerances, as illustrated by specification FIG 12a.

Further, Applicant's discussion at Remarks page 17 states that "tolerance map" refers to "both accumulation maps and functional maps". Said discussion does not adequately clarify the 35 USC 112 indefiniteness rejections of claims 1-12, 16-19, 21-23, and 25-28, per paragraphs 30-34 of the Final Action. Applicant has addressed paragraph 33 of the indefiniteness rejection, but has not addressed paragraph 32 of the indefiniteness rejection.

Further, said indefiniteness rejection must be interpreted in the context of paragraphs 21-28 of said Final Action.

Additionally, Claim 1 remains rejected under 35 USC 102(b), and claim 24 remains rejected under 35 USC 103(a), see paragraphs 36 to 66 of the Final Action.

William Control of the Control of th